

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KHALED FARDJALLAH, Plaintiff V. CHRISTIANA HOSPITAL ,DR. MARIA SHAH AND MR. MICHAEL SCHUH, Defendants	C.A. No.: N23C-05-001
--	------------------------------

SPLITIATION OF JUDICIAL RECORDS

By: /s/ Khaled Fardjallah

Plaintiff/Appellant – Pro Se

117 Stature Dr Newark, DE 19713

Telephone: (267) 595- 9546

Date: 11/15/2025

SPOILIATION OF JUDICIAL RECORDS

COMPREHENSIVE DOCKET ANALYSIS

1. JUDGE MEDINILLA (Previous Judge)

ASSIGNMENT DATE: May 3, 2023

TRANSACTION ID: 69943673

DOCUMENTATION: Formal assignment order properly docketed

AUTHORITY STATUS: VALID - Complete documentation exists

Evidentiary Support: Docket Sheet Page 1, Line 1 - Transaction ID 69943673

2. JUDGE WINSTON (Subsequent Judge)

ASSIGNMENT DATE: September 18, 2023

TRANSACTION ID: 70881869

DOCUMENTATION: Formal reassignment properly docketed

AUTHORITY STATUS: VALID - Complete documentation exists

FUTURE PROCEEDINGS: All scheduled proceedings (Pretrial Conference: December 11, 2025; Trial: January 19, 2026) remain properly assigned to Judge Winston in official docket

EVIDENTIARY SUPPORT: Docket Sheet Page 4, Line 3 - Transaction ID 70881869

3. JUDGE JEFFERY J. CLARK (Current Presiding Judge)

ASSIGNMENT DATE: UNDOCUMENTED

TRANSACTION ID: MISSING


DOCUMENTATION: COMPLETELY ABSENT


AUTHORITY STATUS: VOID - No legal basis for jurisdiction


EVIDENTIARY SUPPORT: Docket Sheet Review - No assignment entries for Judge Clark


SPOLITIATION OF JUDICIAL RECORDS


These images were captured on November 14, 2025 from publicly accessible computers designated for viewing and printing litigation-related documents by parties involved in legal proceedings. The location was the Judgment Office, where the court provides open access to case docket files for authorized individuals.





















































































































































CONCLUSION

The attached images clearly demonstrate a pattern of systematic tampering with judicial records, beginning with the insertion of blank pages between each original page, and culminating in the near-total destruction of key documents following the diversion of the case from its scheduled track on January 19, 2026.

This recurring manipulation strongly suggests unauthorized interference with the official docket and warrants immediate investigation and comparison between the original files submitted by the party and the distorted versions currently present in the court record.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KHALED FARDJALLAH, Plaintiff - Appellant, V. CHRISTIANA HOSPITAL ,DR. MARIA SHAH AND MR. MICHAEL SCHUH, Defendants - Appellees,	C.A. No.: N23C-05-001 APPEAL No.: 424, 2025
--	--

ANALYTICAL MEMORANDUM ON PROCEDURAL AND NUMERICAL MANIPULATION IN CASE NO. 424/2025

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum is based on a forensic review of judicial documents related to **Case No. 424 of 2025**, including an AI-assisted analysis of Judge **Jeffrey Clark's** statement, digital archive records, and a comparative study of civil case numbering patterns in the **Delaware Supreme Court** over recent years. The findings reveal strong indicators of **systematic procedural and numerical distortion**, warranting immediate investigation.

1. Manipulation of Judicial Content

- Judge **Jeffrey Clark's** statement was analyzed using artificial intelligence tools, revealing that its content **does not match** the language presented in the so-called "Summary Judgment" drafted by an administrative and legal team.

- This discrepancy suggests a **strategic misinterpretation** of the judicial text, likely serving a specific procedural agenda.

2. Fabricated Appeal and Suspicious Serial Number Assignment

- An **appeal was fabricated without legitimate procedural basis**, and the case was assigned the serial number **424 of 2025**.
- According to official statistics from the Delaware Supreme Court, the **annual number of civil cases rarely exceeds 250–300**, making the assignment of number 424 **statistically irregular**.

3. Numerical Analysis of Civil Case Records – Delaware Supreme Court¹

<u>Year</u>	<u>Civil Cases</u>	<u>Criminal Cases</u>	<u>Total Filings</u>
2021	242	165	438
2022	202	213	432

- The number **424** exceeds the normal range and constitutes a **numerical anomaly**.
- A separate case numbered **424 of 2024** already exists and was ultimately relegated to the so-called “**graveyard of cases**”, a docket zone often used to **bury or crosswire files**.
- This duplication strongly suggests **intentional reuse or manipulation of case numbers**.

4. Diversion from Scheduled Judicial Track


¹ Source: [Delaware Judiciary 2022 Annual Report](#)


- All of these events occurred after the case was **diverted from its originally scheduled track on January 19, 2026.**
- This procedural deviation reinforces the hypothesis of **unauthorized administrative and judicial interference.**


5. Recommendations

1. Initiate a formal investigation into civil case numbering protocols at the Delaware Supreme Court.
2. Cross-verify original judicial statements with issued rulings using linguistic forensic tools.
3. Audit the "Source History" of court-stored files and compare original file sizes with current versions to quantify data loss or corruption.
4. Suspend any downstream proceedings based on the distorted judgment or fabricated appeal until the investigation is complete.


[illegible]











Page 63 of 85




















STATE OF DELAWARE
vs.

DARSHON ADKINS
DOB: 01/26/1988
SBI: 00457409

Have no contact with Marvin Newbill


Have no contact with Courtney Hayward


Have no contact with Allen White


Have no contact with Raymond Jackson JR


Must comply with any special conditions imposed at any time
by the supervising officer, The Court, and/or The Board of
Parole.


For the purposes of ensuring the payment of costs, fines,
restitution and the enforcement of any orders imposed, the
Court shall retain jurisdiction over the convicted person
until any fine or restitution imposed shall have been paid
in full. This includes the entry of a civil judgment pursuant
to 11 Del.C. 4101 without further hearing.



JUDGE MARK H CONNER























Case:	US Supreme Court Judge:	Supreme Document	File & Servicepress Live Date:	10/9/2025 4:16:45 PM			
Station:	Not Specified	Case Number:	424,2025	Documents Submitted:	12		
Case Type:	Civil Cases	Case Name:	Cardinale, Michael vs. Christiana Hospital, et al.	Data Range:	All		
1 through 12 of 12							
Attachment Date	Attachment	Organization	Document Title	Document Type	Transaction Number	Transaction ID	Original Review
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not
11/19/2025 3:58:43 PM	Supreme Court Deliberation	US Supreme Court	Order on the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus	Order	File And Serve	11/19/2025	Not







EVIDENTIARY FINDINGS AND SYSTEMIC TAMPERING ANALYSIS

The attached images and technical assessments confirm that all motions and memoranda submitted in this case have been subjected to deliberate tampering, as documented within the Superior Court’s public-access terminals in library. Notably, certain documents appear to have been extracted from the Superior Court archive and improperly merged into the appellate record, including Exhibit H, a large file of which only a few pages remain visible.

This pattern is not incidental. The inclusion of fragmented documents and the selective visibility of key exhibits—such as Exhibit -E4—reflect a systematic

effort to destroy and obscure the judicial record, thereby obstructing procedural clarity and evidentiary traceability.

What remains intact are administrative filings and attorney-generated documents, which appear untouched—further suggesting targeted manipulation aimed at the litigant’s core submissions.

Moreover, Case No. 424 of 2024 was buried using the same procedural tactics, and a broader review reveals that civil cases assigned high serial numbers in recent years have consistently been relegated to the appellate court’s archival void, a zone that now functions as a de facto graveyard for manipulated or suppressed cases.

This evidentiary pattern demands urgent scrutiny. It points to a coordinated administrative mechanism designed to neutralize specific filings, distort procedural history, and compromise the integrity of the appellate docket.